

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Official Action mailed on March 11, 2008. This response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 USC §1112, first paragraph. Examiner states that the feature of the spherical membrane being convex with respect to the second membrane that covers the end face of the reflector is not clearly recited in the written disclosure nor is it reasonably inferred from the drawings.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Convex means “curved or bowed outward like the outside of a bowl” (see <http://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/convex>). Referring to the embodiment of Fig. 1, membrane 54 is called in the text on page 5 “spherical membrane 54” and it indeed is clearly drawn as a spherical object with a rounded portion that curves outwards towards and points to second membrane 28. In any case, claim 30 has been amended with the above language and it is felt that this overcomes the rejection.

Claims 20-25 and 28 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassler et al in view of Grunewald et al.

Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassler et al in view of Grunewald et al and Reichenberger.

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassler et al in view of Grunewald et al and Ein-Gal.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. In “Response to Arguments”, the Examiner rebuts Applicant’s remarks, but again, it is respectfully pointed out that it is insufficient to state that “it is well known in the art to include membrane(s) to shield source devices and their associated reflectors from the propagation media”. Applicant again wishes to emphasize that is not the claimed structure. The above statement of the Examiner may be true for one membrane. All the art the Examiner has found uses only one membrane – how then can it be obvious to use two membranes as in the claimed structure of claim 20, namely, “a first membrane that covers an open end of said first shockwave source device in order to seal said first shockwave source device from ingress therein of the propagation medium; [and] a second membrane that covers an end face of said reflector”. The prior art does not show this combination of membranes and reflector. All Examiner has done is cite prior art with ONE membrane. The claimed structure is not known in the art and is deemed patentable.

Once again, Examiner insists on citing a “first” external membrane in Hassler and cites col. 5, lines 19-22 and col. 6, lines 55-57. These passages refer to membrane 1. As explained in detail in the previous responses, Claim 20 recites “a second membrane **that covers an end face** of said reflector” (emphasis added). The membrane [1] of Hassler **does not cover an end face** of reflector 33. It is respectfully noted that the Examiner’s statement that membrane [1] disclosed at col. 5, lines 19-22 and col. 6, lines 55-57 “covers an open end of the device” is an error. Membrane 1 has nothing to do with covering an end face of the reflector.

Applicant respectfully and earnestly requests Examiner to honestly re-examine her understanding of Hassler and Applicant is confident that Examiner will see that her understanding of Hassler is incorrect. If there is any question about that, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone interview together with Supervisor Brian Casler about this point before the issuance of any further action, as well as the next point regarding sources P and E.

Further in the remarks, Examiner steadfastly maintains that in Grunewald, “the membrane (“sealing ring”) of the first device P is a membrane through which the second device E passes. It is reiterated, source P sealingly passes through the sealing ring(s) of E, as necessitated by their spatial arrangement in Fig. 3.”

The above statement is respectfully traversed. Quoting from Grunewald, “FIG. 3 shows a further embodiment of a shock wave source according to the invention, where again a piezoelectric shock wave source P and an electromagnetic shock wave source E are coaxially arranged on the carrier T in such a manner that they radiate onto a common focal point F. In this embodiment, the focussing, in the case of both shock wave sources E and P, takes place by means of the curvature of the carrier T.”

Examiner, with all due respect, has not understood Fig. 3 of Grunewald. But Examiner is not alone. Applicant has also not understood Fig. 3 of Grunewald until now! Examiner and Applicant mistakenly thought the straight line in Fig. 3 covering the opening of the reflector was a membrane. However, upon re-reading of the description it turns out that there is no membrane nor is there any sealing ring at all! The straight line in Fig. 3 covering the opening of the reflector is simply the edge of the bowl-shaped reflector! (There is no propagation liquid.) It is accordingly incorrect to say source P “sealingly passes” through the sealing ring(s) of E – there is no such thing.

Accordingly, claims 20-31 are respectfully deemed patentable. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Application No. 10/620,553

Respectfully submitted,

DEKEL PATENT LTD.

BY /David Klein/

David Klein, Patent Agent

Reg. No. 41,118

Tel +972-8-949-5334

Fax +972-8-949-5323

E-mail: dekelltd@netvision.net.il